



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,228	03/26/2004	Joe Stewart Ramey	571.006	8389
29166	7590	04/26/2005	EXAMINER	
DOMINGUE & WADDELL, PLC			WILLIAMS, THOMAS J	
P.O. Box 3405			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LAFAYETTE, LA 70502			3683	

DATE MAILED: 04/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/810,228	RAMEY ET AL.
	Examiner Thomas J. Williams	Art Unit 3683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 12-38 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/26/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Acknowledgment is made in the receipt of the information disclosure statement and the oath filed March 26, 2004.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

2. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on March 9, 2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the inventions are directed to a single general inventive concept. This is not found persuasive because claims 6-11 are directed to a method of drilling a well, which appears proper for classification in class 166 subclass 381.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claim 28 recites the limitation "The tubular handling device" in line 1 and "said first, second and third slips" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

It appears that the dependency of claim 28 is incorrect.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-5, 12-21, 28-31, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,39,4,201 to Feigel, Jr. et al.

Re-claims 1 and 12, Feigel, Jr. et al. disclose an apparatus for handling a work (or landing) string on a rig, comprising : a bowl insert 18 has an inner portion, the inner portion has a taper greater than 11 degrees, see column 5 lines 6-10; a slip 14 secures the work string within the rotary table, the slip has an outer portion configured to fit into the inner portion of the bowl insert, the outer portion will have a taper complementary of the bowl insert greater than 11 degrees. The outer portion of the slip will have a surface complementary of the bowl, as illustrated in figure 6.

Re-claims 2-4 and 13-15, the range of angles is disclosed in column 5 lines 6-10.

Re-claims 5 and 16, the slip means includes a first, second, and third slip containing a plurality of dies 26 for engaging the work string.

Re-claims 17-20, the apparatus of Feigel, Jr. et al. is capable of being connected to a bottom hole assembly in a well (as known in the art); the landing string is a drill string; the rig may be situated on an ocean (as known in the art); the drill string is capable of containing a casing hanger adapted to engage a sub sea floor on the ocean floor as known in the art. The use of drilling rigs on the ocean is well known in the art when drilling for oil or gas.

Re-claims 21 and 29-31, Feigel, Jr. et al. disclose a tubular handling device, comprising: a first slip having an arcuate inner face and an outer face (see figure 5), the inner face has a first

longitudinally disposed slot, the slot has a first ledge (see figures 5 and 6, note that die 26 is disposed in a slot and rests on a ledge), the slip has an outer portion having a taper greater than 11 degrees (see column 5 lines 6-10); Feigel, Jr. et al. disclose a second and third slip having the same characteristics of the first slip; the slips are connected to one another; a first, second and third insert are provided with respective shoulders for engaging the corresponding ledge.

Re-claim 28, the handling device comprises a bowl insert having an inner portion with a mating taper of greater than 11 degrees, the first, second, and third slips are disposed within the bowl.

Re-claims 37 and 38, the method of engaging a tubular member is anticipated by Feigel, Jr. et al., connecting adjacent tubular members during a drilling process is commonly known in the art.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 22-27 and 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feigel, Jr. et al. in view of US 2,607,098 to Wilson.

Re-claims 22-25 and 32-34, Feigel, Jr. et al. fail to teach the slip devices having a fourth ledge provided in the first longitudinal slot for a fourth insert, a fifth ledge provided in the second longitudinal slot for a fifth insert, and a sixth ledge provided in the third longitudinal slot for a sixth insert. Wilson teaches a particular construction for a slip device 17, wherein each slip

device is provided with a longitudinal slot (see figure 6) containing an insert. Each longitudinal slot of each slip is provided with at least two ledges (defined by notch 27 in slip body 17) for engaging a shoulder of the insert 24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have utilized the slip devices of Wilson in the apparatus of Feigel, Jr. et al., thus providing a slip with an insert having interconnecting ledges and shoulders for maintaining a proper relationship between the slip body and the insert. This is taught by Wilson, see column 4 lines 35-42.

10. Claims 26, 27 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feigel, Jr. et al. in view of Wilson as applied to claims 25 and 34 above, and further in view of US 6,845,814 to Mason et al.

Re-claims 26, 27 and 35, Feigel, Jr. et al. as modified by Wilson fail to teach the material used to manufacture the slip, or specifically the insert for the slip. Mason et al. teach an insert for a slip made from a low carbon alloy steel material, see column 5 lines 16-17. This would provide a sufficient hardness for the slip insert, thus increasing the lifespan of the insert. Furthermore, Mason et al. teach a rotary slip apparatus having handles on each slip device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the slip devices of Feigel, Jr. et al. as modified by Wilson with slip inserts made from a low carbon alloy steel as taught by Mason et al., thus improving the lifespan of the slip insert, as well as provide handles on each slip device of Feigel, Jr. et al. as taught by Mason et al., thus providing a manual means of moving the slip devices during periods of non-engagement with the pipe or string.

Re-claim 36, the angle of the ledge and shoulder as taught by Wilson is between +20 degrees and -20 degrees with respect to the horizontal.

***Conclusion***

11. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Williams whose telephone number is 571-272-7128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Bucci, can be reached at 571-272-7099. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-6584.

TJW

April 20, 2005

THOMAS WILLIAMS  
PATENT EXAMINER

Thomas Williams  
AU 3683  
4-20-05